



ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PROCUREMENT SECTION
1535 WEST JEFFERSON
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007
(602) 364-2517

SOLICITATION NO. RFP ED09-0004

AMENDMENT NO. 03

Solicitation Due Date: December 23, 2008

Page 1 of 14

A SIGNED COPY OF THIS AMENDMENT MUST BE RECEIVED BY THE ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION CONTRACTS AND PURCHASING UNIT AS PART OF THE OFFEROR'S PROPOSAL, OR NOT LATER THAN THE SOLICITATION DUE DATE AND TIME.

1. The attached 13 pages provide ADE's response to questions received from Offerors via email and those submitted in writing following the Pre-Offer Conference held November 25, 2008.

EXCEPT AS PROVIDED HEREIN, ALL TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE SOLICITATION REMAIN UNCHANGED.

Offeror hereby acknowledges receipt and understanding of this solicitation amendment

This solicitation amendment is hereby executed this 4th day of December, 2008, at Phoenix, Arizona.

Name of Company / Agency

Typed Name and Title

Signature

Date

Brian D. Ball
Procurement Officer
Contracts Management Unit
Arizona Department of Education

Question: In the past, the ADE has provided personalized study guides as part of the AIMS HS program, but it is not included in this RFP. Is that program being continued under a separate contract?

Response: This component was not part of the current RFP. If the program continues, there will be a separate RFP.

Question: Could an Offeror bid on all aspects of one component (A or B) and then also just the online option for the other component?

Response: An Offeror must bid on the whole component (A or B).

Question: Will the cost options be included in the evaluated price for award?

Response: (§11.2.4, 11.2.5, 11.3.2, 11.3.3, 11.4.2, and 11.4.3) The optional plan and pricing information requested in the forgoing listed paragraphs will be evaluated for award purposes, both on the technical response and the reasonableness of the offered price. At this point, however, the State cannot guarantee the use of these elements. The optional quote for computer based assessments requested in §11.4. & 11.5. shall not be evaluated for award purposes. All option pricing given shall become part of the firm fixed price of any contract awarded as a result of this solicitation. Attachment 6.1 will be modified to better reflect the State's intent and for evaluation purposes.

Question: Will just one year (2009-2010) be evaluated for award or all five years?

Response: All five years will be considered.

Question: Please clarify how bidders should provide pricing for "ancillary material as needed?"

Response: Attachment 6.1 will be modified to request an hourly rate for any ancillary material not specifically requested that may be needed during the term of the contract.

Question: Will the EA assessments be included in the High School Reading and Mathematics make-up test windows?

Response: The EA assessments will be administered within the established test windows for AIMS HS or AIMS 3-8.

Question: What additional test materials are provided to students taking the AIMS HS and AIMS EA HS (e.g., rulers, protractors, reference sheets)? Are any of these materials also produced for Braille and large-print versions?

Response: Other than the reference sheets for Mathematics in Grades 6, 7, 8, and HS, and the reference sheet for Grade 8 Science that are included in the test books, no additional test materials are provided to students.

Question: Do any of the AIMS HS tests have a Spanish language version of the test?

Response: No.

Question: What is the state's experience with online testing?

Response: The State has limited experience with online testing as a statewide assessment. AIMS A is given as an online assessment to approximately 6,000 annually. The State conducted a pilot with Pearson with the Grade 8 Science field test that included approximately 60 schools and 6,000 students in 2007. The Technology Literacy Assessment was administered to 32,000 students in 52 districts. Several districts have online district tests.

Question: Does the state have a central database/ information about the workstations and network capacity in schools and districts? Is the state collecting such information on a regular basis?

Response: Yes, however it is not as complete as we would like.

- Question:** Do the schools and districts have Technology Coordinator resources?
- Response:** Some districts have this at the district level but the state does not fund this position at the district or school level.
-
- Question:** (page 4) How many high schools administer the AIMS HS tests? Does every high school administer the AIMS HS test in both the fall and the spring? How many of the 600 districts have high schools (for shipping purposes)?
- Response:** There are approximately 530 high schools in 320 districts participating in AIMS HS testing. Virtually all high schools that participate in spring AIMS HS testing also participate in fall AIMS HS testing.
-
- Question:** (page 4)Based on numbers reported for Fall 2007 through the ADE's web site, there were between 40-46,000 tests given (counting both Category 1 and Category 2), depending on the subject area, yet the RFP calls for 75,000 tests in each subject area. Does the 75,000 figure given in the RFP represent the total number of students assessed across all three subject areas or for each subject area on its own? For estimating purposes, should we instead use figures for each subject area that are closer to those reported on the ADE's web site for fall 2007? A similar difference exists between the Spring 2007 reported test counts of approximately 100-105,000 per subject area versus 150,000 for each subject area in the RFP.
- Response:** Please use the numbers presented in the RFP. The number of students reported as tested in ADE's online reports represents only students enrolled in state-funded schools. Students who are enrolled in Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) schools, private schools, and home schooled students also participate in AIMS testing.
-
- Question:** (page 4) How many 9th-grade students typically take the HS science test each year? How many 10th-grade students typically take the HS science test each year? Is the AIMS HS science test administered in the fall? If so, how many students are assessed at that time?
- Response:** The AIMS HS Science has been administered only once and with slightly different participation rules than exist for Spring 2009 and beyond. We expect that 92,000 students will participate in the Spring administration of AIMS HS. However, we don't know how that number will be divided between 9th grade and 10th grade students. There is no fall administration of AIMS HS Science.
-
- Question:** (page 5) The ADE's web site reports test counts of approximately 91,000 for grade 3 down to approximately 85,000 for grade 8 in Spring 2007 (counting both Category 1 and 2), but the RFP provides test counts of 92,000 for each grade level. Assuming that the 92,000 is meant to be an average over the five years, allowing for moderate population growth, should we use that figure for estimating purposes or the lower counts reported on the ADE's web site instead? Also, the RFP shows EA counts of 5,000 per grade. Are these meant to be in addition to the 92,000 per grade for regular assessments or are those intended to be part of the 92,000 per grade?
- Response:** Please use the numbers presented in the RFP. The number of students reported as tested in ADE's online reports represents only students enrolled in state-funded schools. Students who are enrolled in Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) schools, private schools, and home schooled students also participate in AIMS testing. The 5000 students per grade for AIM EA were part of the 92,000 student count. Therefore, the 92,000 for AIMS should be reduced to 87,000 students. Since we have not administered AIMS EA, the counts for AIMS EA are estimates.
-
- Question:** (Page 6, 5th paragraph) With the exception of the last sentence, please confirm that this paragraph refers to multiple choice field testing.
- Response:** Yes, the paragraph refers to multiple choice items to be field tested with the exception of stand-alone writing prompts.
-

Question: (2.6) Please clarify the schedule for the implementation of revised Academic Standards and when new standard setting will be conducted for AIMS EA. The schedule at <http://www.azed.gov/standards/ContentAreaRevisionsAug07.pdf> shows that revised standards for Language Arts (Reading and Writing) are implemented in spring 2012 and Science is implemented in spring 2013. The date given for Science on page 6 does not match the date given in 10.6.2, page 37. Math is listed in 10.6.2 but not on page 6. Please confirm if the content areas and dates in 10.6.2 is complete and correct. Pg 6 indicates EA Reading standard setting to be held in 2010, pg 37 shows additional EA Reading standard settings in 2012. Is this in error? Should Offerors plan for 2010 standard setting only

(10.6.2) Please confirm that standard setting for AIMS EA HS reading will take place both after the spring 2010 assessment and the spring 2012 assessment.

Response: The Mathematics Standard Setting for AIMS HS, AIMS EA, AIMS 3-8 and AIMS EA 4-8 will be held June 2010. AIMS EA Reading for Grades 4-8 and high school will be held in 2010 because it is the first year that the assessment will be administered. Standard Setting will need to be redone in 2012 with the administration of reading assessments that align to the new Language Arts Standard. Science Standard Setting for Grades 4, 8 and high school will be held 2013.

Question: (2.6) "The ADE has an Item Bank of Arizona-owned writing, reading, mathematics, and science items aligned to the Grade Level Academic Standards." Can ADE provide an approximate number of items in the item bank *by grade and subject* that will be available for operational use after the spring 2009 assessments?

Response: The following are the item counts by grade level and subject.

Writing

Grade Level	Number of Prompts
3	13
4	12
5	13
6	13
7	13
8	12
HS	21

Reading

Grade Level	Number of Operational Items
3	389
4	330
5	322
6	292
7	310
8	313
HS	505

Mathematics

Grade Level	Number of Operational Items (includes MFT items)
3	436
4	419
5	352
6	368
7	446
8	465
HS	1020

Science

Grade Level	Number of Operational Items
4	158
8	146
HS	162

Question: (4.1 – 4.5) The RFP specifies the committees that are to be a part of the item and form development and review process. The RFP does not indicate whether separate committees will be convened for AIMS and AIMS EA. Will there be separate committees for these assessments?
Please delineate which committees will be convened for the EA assessments.

Response: Yes, there will be the same, but separate, committees for AIMS and AIMS EA. AIMS EA will need the following committees: Blueprint, PLD, Item Writing, Item Content and Bias Review, Braille, Standard Setting, Item Analysis, and Item Selection.

Question: (4.1.7, 4.1.9, 6.1.6, 6.3.6) The RFP makes reference to writing, mathematics, and science scenarios. Are scenarios presently used in the AIMS assessments and what are their specifications (e.g., length, number of item linked)? How are scenario linked items field tested (e.g., embedded and/or standalone)? Are multiple sets of scenario items developed for each scenario?

Response: Yes, there are currently scenarios in mathematics and science with item sets ranging from two to six items. In order to not become a “reading assessment,” each stimulus has minimal text and/or graphics (tables, charts, etc.). Embedded in the operational test, the items sets were field tested immediately following their associated scenario. In some cases, different item sets were developed using the same scenario. Currently, no writing scenarios have been developed.

Question: (4.2.3) Will the new contractor need to conduct data analysis of items field tested by the previous contractor in Spring 2009 at the start of Year 1 (in the summer 2009)?

Response: No, the existing contractor will conduct the data analysis of field tested items in the summer of 2009.

Question: (4.4) “The Offeror(s) shall in conjunction with the State determine the amount of work the committee is expected to accomplish, the estimated time allotted for the work, number of participants needed to accomplish the task, and establish meeting dates and times.” Are bidders to assume this applies to *each committee* listed in Section 4?

Response: Yes, this applies to all committees held to develop the items and forms for AIMS HS, AIMS EA HS, AIMS 3-8, and AIMS EA 4-8.

Question: (4.4.1) Please confirm that ADE wants Offerors to propose the number of participants and days for the meetings listed in 4.2.2 and 4.2.3. If ADE wants the grade configuration or number of participants to be different from what the Offeror proposes, please confirm that this would be handled through the change management process and price for such meetings may differ. Does ADE have any preferences or established practices for these committee meetings that must continue as they have been done in the past?

Response: Since the completion of the task is the primary objective, the Offeror shall propose the number of Arizona educator participants and workshop days that will be necessary to accomplish the task. Per 4.4, if the task is not completed in the proposed amount of time, the Offeror shall provide additional time with an additional number of Arizona educator participants to bring the task to its completion. It is the contractor’s responsibility to accomplish the task within the scope of the contract and the proposed time frame..

Question: (4.5.4) For costing purposes, what daily rate should be used for substitute reimbursements? If the actual rate differs from the rate used for costing, will the cost difference be handled through the change management process? What is the average substitute reimbursement rate for bidding purposes?

Response: For bidding purposes the average reimbursement for substitutes is equal to the stipend amount.

Question:	(5) What are the reuse rules for multiple choice items and writing prompts? How frequent may items be reused? How many times may items be used operationally before they are retired or released? How often and how many items are released?
Response:	ADE does not have a policy on the reuse of items. A policy is under development and will not be available prior to Offerors' due date.
Question:	(5) Will the ADE provide field test statistics for the "sister items" of the EA items being provided as word documents at the beginning of the contract?
Response:	Yes.
Question:	(5) How much shorter will the EA test blueprints be? Please provide more information on the desired operational test blueprint/design for the EA tests. Given the expectation that the EA tests would be shorter in length than the regular tests, does the ADE have a test length or number of items per strand in mind?
Response:	AIMS EA blueprint is expected to contain approximately 20% fewer items.
Question:	(5.1.2) Please describe the state's expectations or current procedures for accounting for secure, non-scannable test materials that are returned to the contractor.
Response:	ADE would like Offerors to propose their plan for the accounting of secure, non-scannable test materials.
Question:	(5.2) Please confirm that there are AIMS HS Reading and Math make-up tests required, and whether or not these are re-prints of other operational forms. (5.2.1.2) The RFP mentions a spring make-up test for high school writing, but there is no mention of a make-up for high school reading and mathematics. Please clarify
Response:	For spring, there is an AIMS HS Reading make-up form and an AIMS HS Mathematics make-up form. However, these make-up forms are not unique forms, but are re-prints of an operational form.
Question:	(5.2.1.1) "There shall be two new equivalent forms created for reading for school year 2009-2010 and beyond – one for fall testing and one for spring testing. All reading items are multiple choice." Please confirm that the Spring Reading test and Spring Reading Makeup test use the same core and spiraled field test forms, i.e., essentially that the Spring Makeup test for Reading is a later administration of the Spring Reading test forms given the week before. If the Spring Reading makeup test is the same form/field test versions that are administered as the Spring Reading test, please confirm that the data from field test responses in the Spring Reading Makeup test are combined with those from the field test responses of the Spring Reading test prior to the calibration and data review.
Response:	Yes, the Spring Reading test (previously Form A) and the Spring Reading Make-up test (previously Form T) are the same test (same core and field test items) with different book identification. No, field test data are not combined and the data from the Spring Reading Make-up test are not used. The field test items in the Spring Reading Make-up test are only used as placeholders.
Question:	(5.2.1.4) Please clarify what is meant by "In 2010, one of the existing operational forms will be used..." Does this mean that a form constructed for 2009 or earlier will be recycled and administered as the base operational form in 2010?
Response:	5.2.1.4 refers to the AIMS HS Science assessment. Two operational forms were administered in Spring 2008 – one of these forms will be used in Spring 2010.
Question:	(5.2.2) Is a testing window established for the Fall 2009 Writing stand-alone field test?
Response:	Exact test dates have not yet been established. However, the Fall 2009 AIMS HS Writing stand-alone field test will most likely occur during the week of October 26 – 30, 2009.

Question: (5.2.2, 5.4.3) The RFP does not mention the sample size of the Field Test items to be handscored - could you please tell us the minimum sample size per Field Test item to be handscored?

Response: The prompts will be spiraled and administered to all students in a grade level. All field test results will be scored. Selection of training, anchor, and check sets will be pulled from the field test responses.

Question: (5.2.3) Are field test items embedded throughout each section of the operational forms or is there a separate section for field test items embedded somewhere in the operational forms?

Response: Field test items are embedded throughout each section of the operational forms.

Question: (5.2.3.1) Please confirm if it is ADE's expectation that item writing occurs early in the summer and content and bias review occur in late summer. In 2009 would it be possible to have item writing committees meet during the school year?

Response: Yes, item writing will occur in early summer and the content & bias review will take place after item writing later in the summer. No, it is not possible to have item writing during the school year. Three of the many reasons for holding these committees during the summer are as follows.

- 1) The most experienced, skilled Arizona educators are available to serve in the summer.
- 2) School districts are resistant to release their educators during the school year, especially around AIMS testing.
- 3) It is very difficult to obtain the required number of educators during the school year.

Question: (5.3.1.1, 5.3.1.2) These sections specify that there shall be one form for the AIMS HS EA reading and mathematics tests in Spring 2009. Should this be Spring 2010? 5.3.2 indicates that there shall be stand-alone field tests for reading and mathematics in Fall 2009. Please clarify.

These two sections state that, "There shall be two new equivalent forms created...for school year 2010-2011...", and end with, "There shall be one form in Spring 2009." We assume that the last sentence is a typo in light of the fact that the initial field test isn't until Fall 2009. The first part of these sections seems to imply that the first operational administration of EA HS would be in the 2010-2011 school year, but later section 5.3.3.1 includes an embedded field test design for spring 2010 which is part of the 2009-2010 school year. Please clarify when the first operational administration of AIMS EA HS occurs.

The RFP indicates that for AIMS EA HS, there shall be one form in spring 2009. Please confirm that this was stated for information purposes only and that the spring 2009 administration is not in the scope of this RFP.

Response: This was a typo. The AIMS EA will be administered for the first time as an operational assessment Spring 2010.

Question: (5.3.2) What does the ADE anticipate will be the source for the items for the standalone field tests in Spring 2009? Will these be modified from existing items in the Arizona Item Bank or will these be newly generated? In either case, will this work fall under the state's existing contract or the new contract?

Response: Items for the Fall 2009 field test for AIMS EA will be items that have been altered to increase accessibility for student in the 2% population. The State has worked on the items in the current item bank and will give the vendor Word copies of the "new" items.

Question: (5.4) Are all content areas for a grade level (Grades 3 – 8) in a single test book? Please confirm if science is in the same test book as reading, writing, and math or in a separate test book.

Response: The Offeror may propose including science in the grade 4 and grade 8 test books or may propose producing separate science test books for grade 4 and grade 8.

Question: (5.4.1.4) Please clarify what is meant by “In 2010, one of the existing operational forms will be used...” Does this mean that a form constructed for 2009 or earlier will be recycled and administered as the base operational form in 2010?

Response: 5.4.1.4 refers to the AIMS Grades 4 and 8 Science assessments. Both grade levels had two operational forms administered in Spring 2008 – at each grade level, one of these operational forms will be used in Spring 2010.

Question: (5.5) In Section 5.5 Requirements for AIMS EA 4- 8, 5.5.1.1 indicates that reading would be assessed at Grades 4 – 8, but 5.5.1.2 indicates mathematics as being assessed at Grades 3 – 8. Please clarify the grades at which the AIMS EA assessments are to be developed.

Response: This is a typo. AIMS EA Mathematics will be 4-8 also.

Question: (5.5.3) Please confirm whether the stated field test item counts of 20 items for reading and 30 items for math are CRT items only or a combination of modified CRT items and NRT items.

Response: These items are only modified CRT.

Question: (5.6.2.2) Does the state wish that unused Grade 2 scannable NRT books be retained in the district as well or should those unused books be returned to the contractor?

Response: Unused Grade 2 NRT books may be retained in districts for use the following year.

Question: (5.6.2.3) For pricing purposes, can ADE clarify how many students it anticipates taking the assessment online?

Is it desired during the life of this contract to reach specific online testing roll-out levels (eg. 50% of the grade 9 population tested fully online by a certain date)?

For bidding purposes, what online test participation rates should Offerors consider for each grade and for each contract period?

Response: The State is does not have an estimate or goal in mind. We would like the Offeror(s) to suggest participation goals based on their experience in other states.

Question: (6.1.1) “All criterion-referenced (CR) items shall be written by Arizona educators and owned by Arizona Department of Education.” Are bidders to assume this includes CR items for 4-8 EA and HS EA, as well? If yes, are bidders to assume there will be separate item writing committees, etc. for the EA assessments?

Response: Yes, the State will follow the same model for AIMS EA that is in place for AIMS. A committee for AIMS EA will modify items that have been field tested and accepted by the Item Analysis Committee for the regular AIMS items.

Question: (6.1.1, 6.1.7, 6.1.8) To what extent do items developed by Arizona teachers during the item writing committee meetings require rewriting and editing, or are the products of these meetings pretty clean other than graphics content, the creation of which is the responsibility of the Offeror?

Does ADE ever supplement the item development by the Arizona teachers with items written by the Offeror’s content specialist staff and/or experienced independent contractors? If so, should Offerors assume a certain amount of item development to be done by the Offeror’s staff? Please provide specifications for bidding purposes (i.e. number of items per year, etc.).

Response: Although the Arizona educators who are invited to the workshops are very skilled, some editing will be necessary. The past practice of group editing (by Offeror’s facilitators and Arizona educators) has provided a good review process as well as enhanced the quality of future newly written items. After the workshops, the Offeror’s content experts, style editors, graphics experts, etc. will need to review and edit if necessary. Only items written by Arizona educators will be used for the criterion referenced AIMS items. The Offeror will not supplement the item development of Arizona educators with the use of the Offeror’s content specialist staff or other experienced independent contractors.

Question:	(6.1.5) Which readability formulas/indices does ADE prefer? What readability formula(s) does the State currently use to assess the readability levels of the commissioned passages and scenarios?
Response:	The State uses Oleander Solutions Readability Studio 1.1 which utilizes several readability tests to perform its analysis of the text.
Question:	(6.1.9) Please confirm that the Content and Bias Review Committee reviews items for both content and sensitivity issues and that there is not a separate bias/sensitivity committee.
Response:	The Content and Bias Review Committee is conducted as one committee, reviewing for both content and bias/sensitivity issues.
Question:	(6.1.9) Please explain the content and bias review committee's role in reviewing NRT items and how their review differs from the work of the Norm-Referenced Item Alignment committee.
Response:	Due to past experience, the Content and Bias Review Committee must review the NRT items. The Norm-Referenced Item Alignment Committee has the content and alignment of the item to the academic standard as its focus. The Content and Bias Review Committee will verify the content/alignment as well as review the items for possible bias/sensitivity issues.
Question:	(6.3) In what format will the items in the existing AZ Item Bank be provided to the successful Offeror? In what format will statistics be provided?
Response:	The items are in PDF and JPEG formats. The statistics are in MS Access.
Question:	Will it be possible for the ADE to facilitate the transfer of items from the current contractor as Adobe InDesign files, as opposed to JPEG or GIF files from the Arizona Item Bank?
Response:	No, ADE currently does not have Adobe InDesign.
Question:	(6.3) "The Item Bank and the data contained in the Item Bank will be the sole property of the State." Please confirm that the state wishes to own the item content and item statistics housed within the item banking system, and not the item banking system itself. Is the State asking Offerors to develop an item banking system under this contract that will be owned by the State? Or will the item bank content be owned by the State (items, passages/scenarios, graphics, data, etc.), but the item banking system used can be an existing system owned by the Offeror?
Response:	The Item Bank content will be owned by the State. The Item Bank system can be an existing system owned by the Offeror.
Question:	(6.3.1) "Offeror(s) shall manage and maintain the Arizona Item Bank." Exhibit 7.3 contains a screen shot and characteristics of an item bank currently in use by the State. Is this the "Arizona Item Bank"? If so, are the requirements in this section directed towards the maintenance and use of the current "Arizona Item Bank" or are the requirements in this section directed towards the maintenance and use of an item bank to be supplied by the Offeror?
Response:	The requirements in this section are directed towards the maintenance and use of an item bank to be supplied by the Offeror.
Question:	(6.3.8) Exhibit 7.3 for the item bank interface appears to be Microsoft Access. Please confirm or explain the software interface for the item bank. The RFP says, "All features of the Item Bank shall be created in consultation with the State." Please clarify if ADE or the contractor is responsible for making modifications to the technical design/structure/features of the Item Bank.
Response:	The contractor is responsible for making modifications to the technical design/structure/features of the Item Bank.

Question:	(6.2.11) For costing purposes, how frequently should meetings for Item Bank maintenance and modification be conducted? Are these to be in-person meetings or may they be conference or web meetings. Do these meetings focus on the content of the item bank or the technological infrastructure of the bank? (6.3.12) For costing purposes, how many meetings for the purpose of item bank maintenance and modification per year or over the term of the contract should be planned? May these meetings be conducted as a web-based meeting or in conjunction with some other in-person meeting?
Response:	The Offeror shall propose how frequently the meetings need to be and the format of the meetings (in-person, conference, or web). The meetings focus on all aspects of the Item Bank.
Question:	(7) For the AIMS HS writing test, should bidders assume a separate test book and separate scannable answer document, or a scannable test book?
Response:	For AIMS HS Writing, either a scannable answer document or a scannable test book is acceptable. However, if a scannable test book is proposed, a writing draft booklet must be provided as the writing draft pages and the final response pages cannot be in the same document.
Question:	(7.1.8) Are the Large Print versions of the assessments photographic enlargements of the standard test materials, requiring no retype-setting, reformatting and/or modification of graphics?
Response:	Large print is simply a 150% enlargement of the standard test materials.
Question:	(7.1.9) The RFP specifies that a working test map be submitted for use during test form development and a final test map after blueline approval. Is it possible to have a sample of the test map? What type of item description is required for the test maps?
Response:	Example of a test map will be added to the RFP as Exhibit 7.11.
Question:	(7.4.3) How many pages are the current AIMS HS answer documents? Are AIMS HS answer documents generic by subject or form specific by subject?
Response:	The current HS answer document design does not match the design requested in the RFP. So, current page counts are not relevant. HS answer documents are subject specific, but not form specific as long as test form code can be indicated on the answer document.
Question:	(8.4, 8.5.1) Will all precode and enrollment information come from the State or should Offerors provide systems for districts to provide this information?
Response:	The State will provide all precode data. The State will provide initial enrollment information. Districts must have the opportunity to revise enrollment information (test material orders).
Question:	(8.7.4) "Guide to Test Interpretation (GTI). A single GTI shall be developed for each administration of all assessment programs administered by the Offeror including AIMS and NRT programs." Are bidders to assume one GTI for all spring assessments each year and one separate GTI for Fall Retests for High School each year?
Response:	Yes.
Question:	(9.2.6) Should Offerors include the costs of having State staff on site during scanning and handscoring? If so, how many staff members should be budgeted and for how many days? Does this apply to both the fall and spring administrations of the AIMS HS?
Response:	Yes, one person for two days at each scanning site. In addition, one person per handscoring site for all training days and the first two days of scoring.
Question:	(9.4) During the bidder's conference you referenced teacher availability: Will the Field Test prompts for ES & DPA both need be scored in Summer/Fall due to teacher availability for Rangefinding?
Response:	Rangefinding will occur in the summer 2010.

Question:	(10.4) Do any of the special studies listed apply to the AIMS HS (component A)?
Response:	Yes, 10.4.4 and 10.4.6 could apply to AIMS HS (component A) as well as component B.
Question:	(10.6) New standard settings are scheduled in each year. In each of these years that standards are being set, what are the states expectations regarding score reporting given that performance level cuts will not have been determined and in some cases new vertical scales will need to be derived prior to reporting.
Response:	For AIMS 3-8 and AIMS EA 4-8, content areas not part of Standard Setting shall have reports delivered following the RFP guidelines (11.3.1). For AIMS 3-8 Mathematics and AIMS EA 4-8 Reading and Mathematics, Standard Setting will occur June 2010 with results being reported in August. For AIMS 3-8 Writing, Standard Setting will occur June 2011 with results being reported in August. For AIMS 3-8 Reading and AIMS EA 4-8 Reading, Standard Setting will occur June 2012 with results being reported in August. For AIMS 4 and 8 Science, Standard Setting will occur June 2013 with results being reported in August. For AIMS HS and AIMS EA HS, content areas not part of Standard Setting shall have reports delivered following the RFP guidelines. For Spring 2010 AIMS HS Mathematics , only Grade 10 and Grade 11 students will participate in the “new assessment”, graduating students will take an assessment based on the 2005 Achievement Standard and their scores will be reported following the guidelines in the RFP (11.3.2). Grade 10 and Grade 11 student scores will be reported in early August following Standard Setting in June. For Spring 2011 AIMS HS Writing and Spring 2012 Reading, Standard Setting will be held in April and reporting will follow the guidelines for high school Mathematics in the RFP (11.2.3). For Spring 2013 AIMS HS Science, Standard Setting shall occur in June with reports delivered in August.
Question:	(10.6.4) Please confirm that revision of the PLDs is an activity that occurs in conjunction with the standard setting meeting and not at a separate meeting at a later time.
Response:	The PLD Committee will meet prior to writing items. The PLDs will be refined during standard setting.
Question:	(11.2) Should all Offerors include Metametrics as a subcontractor on their bids to provide the Lexile and Quantile services?
Response:	Yes.
Question:	(11.2, 11.5.2) Are AIMS HS summary reports provided both in paper format and electronically to districts?
Response:	Currently summary reports are provided in paper format. The State would like to move to electronic summary reports for districts and school.
Question:	(11.2.4, 11.2.5) Are the following two options intended to be applicable for both the Fall and Spring administrations? Electronic Roster Rpt for AIMS HS read/math/science (Option) and Immediate scoring/reporting using school, district, or regional scanning sites for HS read/math/science. (Option)
Response:	Yes, Everything that we offer to schools and districts in the spring is also offered after the fall administration of AIMS HS.
Question:	(11.2.5, 11.3.3, 11.4.3) Immediate scoring/reporting using school, district, or regional scanning sites. Would the state elaborate on its intent in this requirement? What does the state mean by ‘immediate’? What is the level of information that the state would want provided? Can you provide information about any scanners that might be available in schools, districts or regional scanning sites? Do school and/or districts currently have any infrastructure in place for local scanning of test materials?
Response:	The State would like schools to have immediate raw scores that would be preliminary scores to be use by the school and students. The State does not know what scanners are currently available in districts/school. The State does not have regional scanning sites in place at this time.

Question: (11.3) In requirement 11.3 the RFP states that: "expected student scores based on the State's Growth Model should appear on the Student Report and Confidential Roster Report with Summary for reading and mathematics." What is the State's Growth Model and where will these expected student scores come from? Does "expected student scores based on the State's Growth Model" mean that there are target lexile and quantile scores that need to be added to the report based on the student's level or some other attribute?

Response: The State will provide the growth targets for individual students in the precode file. These targets will be scale scores for AIMS Reading and Mathematics.

Question: (11.3.2) "The Offeror(s) shall provide an optional plan and pricing for electronic roster report of student scores for AIMS 3-8 to be delivered within one week of testing." May bidders assume this report would not include writing scores, only multiple choice scores?
(Attachment 6.1) In Option 3 for Component A, scoring is required within a week of test completion of HS math, reading and science; However, in Option 3, the requirement for AIMS 3-8 is reading, math and writing. Does ADE require writing prompts as well as multiple choice writing items to be scored immediately?

Response: This would be for reading, mathematics, and science, not writing.

Question: (11.5.2) "The State may request additional summary electronic reports." Are bidders to assume no additional costs should be included for any such additional reports at this time?

Response: Offeror can price the cost for additional summary electronic reports.

Question: (pg 46, 11 & 12) With regard to key personnel we presume the state understands and agrees that key personnel are not prevented from accepting promotions or other positions in furtherance of their career development. Is this correct?

Response: Yes, however the State wants the opportunity to review the resumes of the proposed replacement personnel for key position prior to the new person being assigned to the position.

Question: (pg 47, 17) This Offeror presumes the intellectual property specified to be owned by the state in Section 2, Paragraph 17 of the RFP does not include modifications to the Offeror's underlying scoring, reporting systems and software or other Intellectual Property or derivatives of previously developed confidential and/or proprietary materials. Is this correct?

Response: Special Provision # 17 on page 47 clearly addresses background intellectual property, "The Contractor, its agents, subcontractors, officers, or employees shall retain any ownership rights as to any other: proprietary items, test banks, software, or other matter and materials the Contractor developed prior to this Contract, and which the Contractor uses in any performance under this Contract, including the Contractor's standardized norm-referenced test items that are used in this Contract."

Question: (pg 48, 23) Due the events of September 11, 2001 and the failure of some major corporations it has been our experience that sureties are no longer willing to commit to bonds on a multi-year basis and will usually provide Performance Bonds annually. We presume that the state will accept an annually renewable bond for the annual amount of the contract. Is this correct?

Response: Special Provisions # 5 on page 45 states "The term of this Contract shall commence on the date the Procurement Officer signs the Offer and Acceptance Form, signifying ADE's acceptance of the Offeror's proposal and will remain in effect through June 30, 2010, unless terminated, canceled, or extended as otherwise provided herein." An annual renewable bond would be correct, when the above is interpreted in conjunction with Special Provision # 23 on page 48.

Question: (pg 63, 6.A.(13)) "Equating the proposed nationally normed standardized achievement test to Arizona's current nationally normed standardized achievement test (Stanford 9)" We assume this should be Terra Nova, not Stanford 9.

Response: Yes, that is correct.

Question: (pg 64, 7.A) Should bidders provide an original and 8 copies of the Executive Summary Section?
Response: Yes

Question: (pg 64, 7.E. (1)) "This Section shall include 2 signed original of the Offer and Award completed Attachments 6.1, 6.3, 6.5, 6.6 (if applicable), and 6.7." Will the state confirm that it wants 2 signed copies of these documents?

Response: The state wants two signed originals of the Offer and Award, Attachment 6.1. Only one copy of Attachments 6.3, 6.5, 6.6 (if applicable) and 6.7 are required.

Question: (pg 64, 7.E.(1)) Should Offerors include any sort of narrative in addition to the required forms and attachments in the Executive Summary section of the proposal?

Response: No.

Question: (Attachment 6.1) Pricing/Delivery schedule does not contain cost lines for fixed costs such as program management, travel/meeting, software, etc. Can we add lines to accommodate these costs? If not, where does the state recommend that these fixed costs be included? In Attachment 6.1 there is currently no place to provide prices for section 3 or 4. Please advise where ADE would like to see prices for requirements 3.5.4 and 4.

Response: Attachment 6.1 will be modified to provide a place for offerors to propose their management fee (section 3.5.4). Each committee listed in section 4 will produce an outcome/completion of a task. The offeror will be paid for those committees when the task/outcome is completed and ADE receives the corresponding deliverable listed on the price sheet.

Question: (Attachment 6.1) Pricing/Delivery schedule contains the line "Transition From Offeror to New Contractor (If Applicable)" for every year of the contract. Does the state wish to see these costs included in the total for every year or just the last year?

Response: Since this is a one year contract with 4 additional option years, the state requires this information for every year.

Question: (Attachment 6.1) Could the State please provide an unlocked copy of the Excel spreadsheets so that Offerors can use the forms?

Response: Yes, Upon request, but for offerors internal use. ADE requires offerors to use and include the locked copy with their submitted proposal to ADE.

Question: (Attachment 6.1) Estimated student populations: Spring 2010, 2012, 2013, 2014- Scan and Score Answer Documents estimated student population is 402,000. Spring 2011- Scan and Score Answer Documents estimated student population is 267,000. Is there a reason why Spring 2011 has such a lower expected student count for Scan and Score Answer documents?

Response: Attachment 6.1 will be reviewed and modified to address this and other issues previously discussed in this response.

Question: (Attachment 6.1) Fall 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013 Administration Services: Pre-coded scannable student identification labels (Operational and Stan-Alone FT)- estimated student counts is 230,000. Fall 2009: Pre-coded scannable student identification labels (Operational and Stan-Alone FT)- estimated student counts is 305,000. This difference in student populations for Fall 2009 is 75,000 students. This would account for the Fall 2009 Writing Standalone FT (census FT). But it doesn't seem to account for the EA HS Reading and Math FT. Should vendors increase the 2009 Precoded scannable student identification labels to also account for the EA HS Reading and Math FT?

Response: Attachment 6.1 will be reviewed and modified to address this and other issues previously discussed in this response.

- Question:** (Attachment 6.1) In the Prices/Delivery Schedule for Component A (HS), standard setting for AIMS HS reading and AIMS EA HS reading are listed in both year 3 (spring 2012) and year 4 (spring 2013). Please clarify.
- Response:** Attachment 6.1 will be reviewed and modified to address this and other issues previously discussed in this response.
-
- Question:** (Attachment 6.1) For 5.6.2 NRT (Both Online & Paper/Pencil Test for Grade 9) Years 1 – 5, where should bidder's identify any costs associated with online testing other than form development, such as site readiness services, staff training and administrator training and support?
- Response:** Attachment 6.1 will be reviewed and modified to address this and other issues previously discussed in this response.
-
- Question:** (Attachment 6.4) The RFP states that a copy of attachment 6.4 should be included in the proposal for each of the required positions listed in section 3.5.4 on page 9. If the Offeror names any additional staff members in support roles, does a copy of attachment 6.4 need to be included for those staff members, or can Offerors just include standard resumes?
- Response:** Offerors should use attachment 6.4 for these additional staff member.
-
- Question:** On page 3, second paragraph under 1.B there is a request for an optional price for administering the Grade 9 NRT online, whereas page 21, section 5.6.2.3 makes it appear as though this is required. Also, the Grade 9 NRT is not listed with the HS Science as an online option in the pricing sheets. Please clarify whether this should be included as an option or as part of the base proposal.
- Response:** The NRT computer based assessment for Grade 9 is a required element to be included in all submitted proposals. The State is requesting the cost for the administration of NRT Grade 9 both as a paper-pencil assessment and a computer based assessment. Districts/Schools will have the option of deciding which model they want to use. Grade 9 NRT is not part of Component A, High School but part of Component B, Grades 2-9 (NRT and AIMS 3-8). This element shall be included with any proposal that contains an offer for Component B.
-